

### **Remarks**

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2008 and a telephone interview with Examiner Shaw on January 26, 2009. Applicant acknowledges the courtesy of an interview with the Examiner, during the course of which interview several amendments to the claims were discussed, the substance of which amendments are set forth fully herein.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2008, Claims 1-24 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090, hereafter Amirisetty).

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendments**

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 11, 15-16, and 20; adds Claims 25-28, and cancels Claims 4-5, 7, 14, 17, and 22, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 15-16, 18-21, and 23-24. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2008, Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Amirisetty (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A storage medium including software system applications for providing access to web services, comprising:  
a container driver that accepts an invoke request for a web service from a client wherein the invoke request is a web service message having a message format;  
a protocol adapter that  
intercepts the invoke request,  
converts the message format of the invoke request, and  
creates an initial message context including the invoke request, a placeholder for a response, and information about a transport;  
wherein the protocol adapter then passes the invoke request with the initial message context to the container driver;*

*an interceptor that*

*receives the initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content, and*

*modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context;*

*an invocation handler that receives the modified message context from said container driver, passes parameters from the modified message context to the target of the request, processes values returned from the target, and passes the values to the container driver, such that the container driver can formulate a response to the invoke request; and an invocation context that stores context data for processing the invoke request including a conversation ID, a message sequence number, and a security token, wherein the invocation context is an inheritable, thread local object, and wherein the invocation handler controls read/write access to the invocation context.*

Claim 1, as amended, defines a protocol adapter that intercepts the invoke request, converts the message format of the invoke request, and creates an initial message context including the invoke request, a placeholder for a response, and information about a transport, and wherein the protocol adapter passes the invoke request with the initial message context to the container driver; and an invocation context that stores context data for processing the invoke request including a conversation ID, a message sequence number, and a security token, wherein the invocation context is an inheritable, thread local object, and wherein the invocation handler controls read/write access to the invocation context.

Amirisetty discloses that Common Client Interface (CCI) **112** may be described as a set of interfaces representing application interaction with the connector **114**. (Column 8, lines 22-24). Additionally, Amirisetty discloses a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) framework for an application server environment. (Abstract). An implementation of a metadata-aware CCI adapter **102** may provide unified CCI (e.g. J2EE CA-suggested CCI) for client interaction across disparate connectors **114**. Adaptor **102** may also provide an in-memory, hierarchical data representation object for interaction. Adaptor **102** may be metadata-aware and may interact with the metadata repository **130** to get the definitions of connection specifications, interactions, interaction specifications, records, etc. Adaptor **102** may pre-create instances as per the definitions retrieved from the metadata repository **130**. Adaptor **102** may also interact with XML-aware CCI glue **128**, which may be implemented on top of the connector **114**. (Column 8, lines 63-67; and Column 9, lines 1-7). Amirisetty further discloses that metadata may be stored in a metadata repository. In one embodiment, the metadata repository **130** may be modeled atop a JNDI (Java

Naming and Directory Interface) namespace, and access may be via a JNDI service provider. The metadata repository 130 may include, but is not limited to, input/output type definitions 132 (reusable across data sources), transformation definitions 134 (reusable across data sources), and logical data source and function definitions 136. (Column 11, lines 27-35).

As described above, Amirisetty appears to disclose adapters that present a common interface to clients. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define a protocol adapter that intercepts the invoke request, converts a format of the invoke request, and creates an initial message context including the invoke request, a placeholder for a response, and information about a transport. Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly define that the protocol adapter passes the invoke request and the initial message context to the container driver. Applicant respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not disclose a protocol adapter as defined in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define an invocation context that stores context data for processing the invoke request including a conversation ID, a message sequence number, and a security token, wherein the invocation context is an inheritable, thread local object, and wherein the invocation handler controls read/write access to the invocation context. While Amirisetty appears to disclose a metadata repository that is accessible via JNDI and contains various definitions, Applicant respectfully submits that Amirisetty does not appear to disclose an invocation context as defined in Claim 1.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 11 and 20**

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 11 and 20 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 11 and 20, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-24**

Claims 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-24 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 11, or 20. Claims 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-24 have not

been addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-3, 6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, and 23-24 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 4-5, 7, 14, 17, and 22**

Claims 4-5, 7, 14, 17, and 22 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

**IV. Additional Amendments**

Claims 25-28 have been newly added by the present Response. Applicant respectfully requests that new claims 25-28 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 2, 2009

By: /Nathan L. Feld/  
Nathan L. Feld  
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 80548  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800